

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, later on this evening, the gentleman from New Jersey, DON PAYNE, and other Members of Congress will continue to pay tribute to my fallen buddy, Ron Brown, but I just want to share some views as I saw Ron and 33 other coffins arrive in Dover, these flag-draped coffins covering the bodies of people that were in the business of selling the United States of America, and then heard the tributes that were paid to all of them, as well as attending at Arlington cemetery.

As the bands were playing and the flags were unfurled and the cannons were blasting, I could only think what a great country we live in and how many things we just take for granted; that here a young American who comes from one of the poorest communities can, in such a short period of time, capture the love and gain the respect of not only the President of the United States but so many Americans from seashore to seashore, and, at the same time, to know that in so many foreign countries, some not as friendly as we wish that they would be, that they lowered their flags at half mast for this great American, Ron Brown.

I think that when we start thinking about loving America, we have to think about what kind of person could love his country so much that he would try to climb mountains that other people would not even attempt, not only to show how great America was and what products we wanted to sell, and not how superior we were, but to actually talk with trade ministers and prime ministers and presidents in terms of the needs of their country. The poverty, the disease, the sickness, the hunger, the unemployment, the joblessness, and to be able to say to that country that America was there as a friend that wanted to help.

This was a part of the world that we never spent that much time in. This was the part of the world that we had to develop markets in. This was the part of the world that we had to increase their ability to have disposable income so that as we had once done in Europe under the Marshall plan, that we could regain the leadership that we have possessed since World War II. And how they loved him, because it was not just selling America, it was the interest he had in them.

I saw at the funeral Ambassadors that had flown in from Mexico, India, South Africa. They spoke, they talked, they loved, they cared. And I said what a wonderful country it is that we have in the United States of America, people that come from every country in the world.

□ 1730

Unlike other countries where you just look at the country and you can feel just the narrow culture interest that they have, there is no country in the world that we cannot reach and show that Americans come from all over. To see what investing in the edu-

cation of a Ron Brown, or Ron Gonzalez, or Ron Lee, or the women that have been denied the opportunity to show, to be given the opportunity to show that they are Americans, this is a great country, and go abroad and find out that they are making friends for us, as well as creating trade.

Mr. Speaker, I have received notices, as well as telephone calls, from Senator DOLE and from Haley Barbor, who is the chair of the Republican Party, to say to me, as they have said to others, this issue is too big to look at party labels. It is too big to look at the color of American skins. It is American to be able to say that we can make our country a greater place, create more jobs if only we cared enough to train our people for these type of opportunities and to share our talents with so many other countries in the world.

#### RIGHTFUL ROLE OF GOVERNMENT TO DEFEND THE DEFENSELESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the sentiments of my colleague from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I take the well today to talk a little bit about an issue I think that is of great and paramount importance to both sides of the aisle that serve in this august body. For the last 15 months, we have watched as the House of Representatives struggles with public policy questions. What is the rightful role of government? To what extent do we fund these programs? What programs work? What programs do not work?

For 15 months, it has been a very healthy, although at times contentious, debate. It gets at the very heart of what democracy is all about. Taking these issues to the American people, to the floor of the House of Representatives and having a good give and take. We are trying to understand, as we are on the threshold of a new millennium, where to take America. What are our priorities? And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that as we think about those priorities, we think about a government that most of us would like to be benevolent, caring, there for those who cannot help themselves.

We need to think of the question that gets at the heart of the highest, most precious part of the human experience, and I speak with reference to those moments when a young woman and her husband, a young man and wife, learn the terrific news that there is going to be a birth of a child. Their excitement, their love, their exhilaration is unmatched by almost anything else that one could experience in life, and I do not think there is an American, whether they be described as pro-choice or pro-life, that cannot appreciate that very important and most precious moment in the human experience.

It leaves me, Mr. Speaker, mystified, wondering if the rightful role of government is not to step forward, to indeed protect the most defenseless among us, that nurturing, growing life within the womb, that most precious experience in a woman's existence. What is the rightful role of government, I ask, if not to protect that defenseless life? Yet we had an issue, and I speak principally to the issue of the late-term partial birth abortion ban, and the question of government's rightful role to step in at a period when this baby, growing within the womb, is 4½ months along, or on the eve of a birth. Yet this procedure continues and will continue because a bill that was sent to the White House was rejected. Despite the safeguard stipulating that there must be an absolute threat to the life of the mother, the President chose to veto this bill. The same president who as Governor could have been at one point described as pro-life now sides with the radical left on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I ask again, what is the rightful role of government if not to step forward at these most important moments to defend the defenseless, to step forward for our children? Is there anything so precious in life, in society as the birth of a child, as the potential growth of a new human life? And yet, this partial birth abortion procedure, which some say is a rare occasion, well, I would say one occasion is too many. There are, as I have been told, some very infrequent times when the life of the mother is so threatened that this procedure is performed. But I am also told that the American Medical Association, its college of legislative people and the 12 doctors therein, have said that this is an unnecessary procedure.

Mr. Speaker, as I yield the podium, I would just ask that if the rightful role of government is not to defend the defenseless, to defend precious life, then what is the role of government?

#### THE TRADE DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, here in Washington there was a public relations blitz organized by the administration to tell us and the world how United States trade relations with Japan have improved. National Economic Council Chair Laura Tyson went so far as to state we have had a great record of success with the Japanese in the area of trade with our exports increasing by one-third since 1993, and we have seen the trade deficit come down, she said, for the first time in 5 years, so we have a strong record of success.

Well, you know, people can twist numbers in amazing ways. If the administration had such a strong record of success, why has the United States trade deficit with Japan worsened during the Clinton watch and become even

worse than during the Bush years when the United States trade deficit with Japan reached all-time highs? Look at the facts.

During the first 3 years of the Bush administration, the United States trade deficit with Japan reached over \$133.5 billion. During the first 3 years of the Clinton administration, our trade deficit with Japan has soared to over \$185 billion. That is \$50 billion worse, according to my math, and a 39-percent increase. Wishing a problem away certainly will not make it so, and Japan knows it. Our Nation gains nothing by denial.

Facts again: During the Bush years, the 4 years, the total trade deficit with Japan reached over \$183 billion, an all-time record. President Clinton has racked up that amount in just his first 3 years. In fact, during the Clinton watch, the trade deficit with Japan has rung in at all time record highs each year, \$60 billion in the red in 1993, \$65.7 billion in the red in 1994, and \$60 billion in the red in 1995. We cannot project what the United States-Japan trade deficit will be this year, but all indicators are that the total for the 4 years of Clinton's time will easily be over \$230 billion to the deficit side of the ledger.

Let us take a look at the automotive sector, which still accounts for over half of the deficit with Japan, more exports coming over here, fewer of our imports going into their market.

Remember when President Bush journeyed to Japan late in his Presidency and became ill at the official dinner held during the automotive trade rift? This is not a new problem. I personally have been working on opening Japan's market to United States goods for over a decade. I can tell Members Japan's auto market largely remains closed. They continue to believe we are not really serious.

United States auto manufacturers still have less than 1 measly percent of Japan's auto market, yet Japan holds upwards of one-third of our market. Think about this. With our low interest rates, the value of our dollar against the yen has fallen 40 percent since 1990, which means that our products are 40 percent cheaper in Japan. Yet we gained only one-third of 1 percent additional market penetration in Japan in 1995.

While we were able to sell about 58,000 cars there last year, Japan has sold over 100 times that amount in our country over the last decade. When I ask my local auto people, how are you doing, they smile and they look down.

In a recent survey of United States auto parts suppliers to Japanese customers, two-thirds of our suppliers say they are working hard to crack Japan's market with roughly half of those responding saying they are currently achieving either limited success, sporadic success or no success at all in really opening that market.

Can you imagine, in the second largest marketplace in the world, if we could get trade reciprocity with Japan,

the amount of jobs we could create in this country, in shipping, in distribution, in manufacturing, in parts, et cetera? Compare the limited success of United States auto and auto parts manufacturers to crack Japan's market to the administration's exaggerated claims.

Friends, let us stop the denial. You cannot look at these numbers and not know that trade is going one way and not the other. We have scaled an ant hill in our efforts to open Japan's market. Now all that is left is the mountain of red ink to scale.

#### MORE ON THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTION BAN BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, a great Democrat who came from my State, perhaps one of the most articulate spokesmen for the Democratic Party over the last 30 or 40 years, Hubert Humphrey, once said that if you love your God, you must love his children.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the tragedy of the partial birth abortion issue and what the President has done with his veto. I rise to congratulate the National Conference of Catholic Bishops because I think they have, in very strong words, expressed on behalf not only of Catholics but I think of millions of Americans that have conscience of both political parties the outrage of this grisly procedure and the action of the President by vetoing it, keeping it legal here in the United States.

This is not a Republican issue. It is not a Democrat issue. It certainly is not just a Catholic issue. I think it is an issue about our basic humanity and how we treat the most vulnerable among us.

I would like to read for the RECORD a letter from a gentleman in Texas. For those who may be watching, I would be happy to make available to them a copy of this letter as well as a letter from the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, because they are both extremely powerful letters. I think all Americans should have an opportunity to read them.

□ 1745

I want to read this for the record, Mr. Speaker:

Hon. BILL CLINTON.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On Wednesday evening, when I learned that you had vetoed the partial birth abortion bill, I felt stunned and angry, but mostly I felt betrayed. Betrayal is a strong word. However, President Clinton, this is the anguish that I and many Democrats across the nation feel now.

As a dedicated Democrat, I believed Bill Clinton during the primary campaign in Texas in 1992 and in the general election as our nominee when you vowed to protect the

rights of individuals and to forge an era of the new Democrat, an era that would avoid the extremism of either side.

I campaigned for that Bill Clinton and stood proudly in the cold in Washington at your inauguration when you gave your message of hope for those who have no voice. But Wednesday, with your veto, you ignored the rights of the innocent little children and literally sentenced them, thousands probably before this madness is brought to an end, to their deaths.

Unlike the debate over abortion that has been ongoing for decades, this procedure is clearly the brutal taking of a human life. The right-to-choose position of the Democratic Party has largely been driven by the belief that a fetus cannot survive outside the mother's womb. But in this case, medical evidence is clear that these babies could survive, but are destroyed in the most vicious and inhumane way possible. Our society demands that even dogs be destroyed in a more humane fashion.

For what purpose, Mr. President, did you do this? To satisfy a minority of extremists whose votes you would have gotten anyway? And please, consider again your rationalization that you acted to "protect the safety of the mother," when the bill permitted an exception if a doctor deemed the procedure was necessary to save the mother's life. You know full well that the bill would not have received the support of the Council on Legislation of the American Medical Society and 73 Democrats in the house if it did not. Mr. President, with all due respect, there is no valid reason for your action, ethically or politically. And it is certainly inconsistent with your positions that you have taken.

Your presence and comments in Oklahoma last week on the anniversary of the bombing tragedy reflected your deep concern for those who perished, especially the children. Yet, you signed the death certificate on Wednesday for countless equally innocent children. Several weeks ago I saw you visibly shaken when speaking of the mass murder of the children in Scotland. You had a chance, with your vote, to prevent a much greater tragedy. Mr. President, you chose instead to trade those future lives for votes that you perceive are crucial to your reelection.

In the past three years I have seen you time and time again speak out to the thousands, maybe millions, of young Americans who have been lost to the streets in a life of murder, destruction and mayhem, of drugs and disease.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to put the full text of this letter in the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

EL PASO, TX,  
April 12, 1996.

Hon. BILL CLINTON,  
President of the United States, Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT CLINTON: Wednesday evening when I learned that you had vetoed the partial-birth abortion bill, I felt stunned and angry. But mostly, I felt betrayed.

Betrayal is a strong word. However, President Clinton, this is the anguish that I and many Democrats across the nation feel now. As a dedicated Democrat, I believed Bill Clinton during the primary campaign in Texas in 1992, and in the general election as our nominee when you vowed to protect the rights of individuals and to forge an era of the New Democrat. An era that would avoid extremism of either side. I campaigned for that Bill Clinton and stood proudly in the cold in Washington at your inauguration when you gave your message of hope for those who had no voice. But Wednesday, with your veto, you ignored the rights of innocent little children and literally sentenced them (thousands probably before this madness is brought to an end) to their deaths.